

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant would like to inform the Examiner that the undersigned attorney has taken over prosecution of the subject application and that a revocation of power of attorney and a new power of attorney will be submitted shortly. Thus, with regard to this Amendment "A", the undersigned attorney is acting under 37 CFR §1.34.

Claims 1-42 are currently pending in the present application. In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-9, 11, 14, 17-21, 23-26, 38, 39 and 41. Reconsideration of the application in its current format is hereby requested.

In the Office action, the Examiner stated that the information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/17/2004 is not being considered by the Examiner, since the "Examiner fails to find the WO publications in the record". Presumably, copies of the WO publications were not included in the 2/17/2004 IDS. In response, Applicant is filing herewith an IDS containing the WO publications and additional references.

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of a missing comma in paragraph [0031]. In response, Applicant has amended paragraph [0031] to insert a comma.

The Examiner has objected to claim 10 and claims 19-20 for referring to elements in preceding claim 9 and claim 18, respectively, that are not necessarily present. In response, Applicant has amended claims 9 and 18 to affirmatively recite the elements.

The Examiner has rejected independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246 to Wright et al. in view of U.S Patent Application Publication 20030009705 to Thelander et al. In

addition, the Examiner has rejected independent claims 26 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Wright et al. application. For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant traverses these rejections.

The Wright et al. application discloses an intelligent electronic device (IED) having the ability to send and receive e-mail. The Wright et al. application discloses that the e-mail may include “non-text files, such as data or program files...., as attachments sent in binary streams” (paragraph [0037]). The Wright et al. application further discloses that an “*e-mail attachment may contain a configuration file that causes the IED 105 to simultaneously change several operating parameters, or it may contain a command that causes the IED 105 to perform a certain function at a certain time*” (paragraph [0042]). Thus, the Wright et al. application shows an IED that is capable of receiving a file that can change its configuration. The Wright et al. application, however, fails to show a tool with the limitations recited in the claims that can create such a file that can be received by the IED 105. In particular, the Wright et al. application fails to show or suggest a configuration tool having a plurality of databases containing protection, control and monitoring information for power protection and restoration devices, or a calculation engine that uses the information in the databases to generate a configuration file. In the Office action, the Examiner finds the memory 205 as having a plurality of databases. The memory 205, however, is *in the IED 105 and not in a separate configuration tool*. Thus, the Wright et al. application fails to show or suggest:

an “*automatic configuration tool*” having “*a memory storing a plurality of databases containing protection, control and monitoring information for power*

protection and restoration devices", as is presently recited in independent claim 1.

For at least this reason, the Wright et al. patent fails to show or suggest independent claim 1 and, thus, claims 2-25, which depend therefrom.

With regard to the selection of settings options and their processing by the calculation engine, it is not clear how the Examiner is applying the Wright et al. application. The Examiner somehow finds the ability of the IED 105 to receive configuration settings as disclosing the selection of presented settings options. The Examiner then goes on to state that "There must be a calculation engine to process the entered options by the user". First, there is nothing in the Wright et al. application that discloses or suggests that a user at the valid system 305 or other site is even presented with a plurality of settings options, let alone that the user interactively selects presented settings options using a graphical user interface. Second, even if the Wright et al. application was somehow construed as showing a selection of options, a calculation engine does not have to necessarily be present. A selected setting option could simply be implemented without further processing. Applicant submits that the Wright et al. application does not show a selection of presented settings options, let alone the processing of such selected settings options to produce a plurality of protection, control and monitoring settings, as required by the claims. Thus, the Wright et al. application fails to show or suggest:

"selecting a plurality of presented settings options interactively using a graphical user interface", as is presently recited in independent claim 26;

"processing the selected plurality of options using the calculation engine and the information in the databases to determine a plurality of protection, control and

monitoring settings", as is presently recited in independent claim 26;

"displaying a plurality of settings options using a graphical user interface" and "receiving selections of the displayed settings options" as recited in independent claim 40; and

"processing the received selections using the information in the databases to determine a plurality of protection, control and monitoring settings", as recited in independent claim 40.

For at least these reasons, the Wright et al. application fails to show or suggest independent claims 26 and 40 and, thus, claims 27-39 and 41-42, which depend therefrom, respectively.

Neither the Thelander et al. application, nor the Sezi et al. reference cure the foregoing deficiencies of the Wright et al. application. The Sezi et al. reference provides an overview of various features of IEDs, but does not disclose and is not cited as disclosing a configuration tool that generates a settings file using databases and a calculation engine. The Thelander et al. application is directed to a method and system for controlling the power management profiles of computers connected through a network, and is merely cited as showing a plurality of menus displayed to a user through a GUI to select appropriate settings. The Thelander et al. also does not disclose a configuration tool that generates a settings file using databases and a calculation engine.


Since the Thelander et al. application and the Sezi et al. reference do not cure the deficiencies of the Wright et al. application, Applicant submits that claims 1-42 are patentable over the Wright et al. application, the Thelander et al. application and the

Sezi et al. reference, individually and in combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 050877.

Respectfully submitted,

ABB Research Ltd.

By: 
Paul R. Katterle, Reg. No. 36563

July 24, 2006

c/o ABB Inc.
29801 Euclid Avenue-4U6
Wickliffe, Ohio 44092-2530
(440) 585-7968